DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 655 CS 502 678

AUTHOR Griffis, Betty Ann
TITLE Crosscultural Issues in the Process of Sending U.S. Employees of Multinational Corporations for Overseas Service: Theoretical Considerations with Practical Implications.
PUB DATE Nov 79
NOTE 54p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (65th, San Antonio, TX, November 10-13, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Business; *Cross Cultural Training; *Cultural Interrelationships; Employee Attitudes; Employer Attitudes; *Employer Employee Relationship; *Foreign Nationals; *Organizational Communication; Research Needs
IDENTIFIERS *Intercultural Communication

ABSTRACT

Defining the multinational as a producing enterprise motivated by profit and owning or controlling facilties in more than one country, this paper analyzes the process employed by United States multinationals in sending parent country nationals abroad for service in a subsidiary. It first examines the process in its fullest form by citing practical and theoretical viewpoints in current literature and then explores the actual practices, according to this process, used by multinationals. Next, it defines the problem area by showing the disparity between the fullest definition of the process "at best" and the actual process as practiced "in reality." The paper concludes that the gap exposed by this contrast is antithetical to a multinational's smooth operation and interferes with necessary communication on the macrolevel between parent company and subsidiary and on the microlevel between an employee on overseas service and host national employees. The organization of a professional cross-cultural training field and the establishment of a theoretical framework are suggested as means of internationalizing the outlook of the multinationals. (FL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177655

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CROSSCULTURAL ISSUES IN THE PROCESS OF SENDING U.S. EMPLOYEES OF MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS FOR OVERSEAS SERVICE: THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS WITH PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Betty Ann Griffis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS502678

Betty Ann Griffis
Dept. of Adult and Continuing Education
Michigan State University

ABSTRACT

The author defines the multinational as a producing enterprise, motivated by profit, owning/controlling facilities in more than one country and analyses the process by which the MN sends, sustains, and brings back a parent country employee to and from a foreign subsidiary. The author synthesizes current literature to reveal the process 'at best,' an integrated program based on a broad-international outlook and contrasts this with the picture 'in reality,' a narrow, pragmatic, piecemeal approach as illustrated by two studies by P. Teague and the author. The author concludes the gap exposed by contrast is antithetical to the MN's smooth operation and interferes with necessary communication on the macro-level between parent company and subsidiary and on the micro-level between a p.c. employee on overseas service and host national employees. Research to establish need for internationalization of outlook for the MN; and both the organization of a professional cross-cultural training field, and establishment of theoretical framework are suggested for this purpose.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Definition of the Problem Area	1
	A. Definition of the Multinational as Subject	1
	B. Definition of the Process Under Consideration	4
II.	The Process: "AT BEST"--A Five Part Description	5
	(1) Conception of Identity as a Multinational	
	(2) Selection	
	(3) Orientation	
	(4) Re-entry	
	(5) Relationship between parent company and p.c. employee during foreign service	
III.	The Process: "In Reality"	28
	A. Practices as Revealed through Research . . .	
	B. Discussion of Findings	
	C. Relating Findings to the Process	
IV.	Conclusion: Revealing the Problem Through Comparison of II and III	38
V.	Suggestions	46
VI.	Bibliography	49

I. DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM AREA

A. The subject of this paper is the multinational enterprise in the U.S., although much of the discussion could apply to multinationals in general. I have chosen Dunning's definition of the multinational, which he refers to as the Multinational Producing Enterprise--"an enterprise which owns or controls producing facilities (i.e., factories, mines, oil refineries, distribution outlets, etc.) in more than one country" (Dunning, 1971, p. 16). This qualifies the multinational in two aspects: first, as having one established locus of either ownership and control rather than affiliated but co-nationally owned and/or operated companies and, secondly, as having 'producing' facilities in more than one country rather than being solely involved in sales of domestically produced products abroad.

The understanding of the terminology used in multinational enterprises to designate the various structures of the company, their locations and personnel will further clarify the above definition as well as give the tools for discussing the subject. Dunning (1971, p. 5) gives the following terminology: "Host Country" is any country which receives foreign direct investment and in which a particular subsidiary is operating; "Home Country" is the country from

which foreign direct investment is made and the country of origin of the company; the "Parent Company" is the company which owns and controls the investment, the "Head Office" (head quarters) is the central organization of the firm, the foreign subsidiary (affiliate) is the corporate firm which represents the foreign direct investment. The international division is the part of the head office with a foreign geographical responsibility. Zeira (1975, p. 96) gives the terminology for those working in the Multinational Enterprise as: "parent country national's" those whose original assignment of employment was to the parent country; "host country nationals," those who were hired in and for work in the country of the subsidiary firm; and "third country nationals," those hired from countries other than the host or home country for employment in either of those countries.

A brief historical view of the multinational enterprise suffices for the purposes of this paper for giving a perspective to the U.S. Multinational Enterprise. According to Brooke and Remmers (1970) multinational companies have been in existence for hundreds of years, but their existence in terms of the definition of this study has really been in intensive terms only in the last half century. The most phenomenal boom came in the post World War II period and this has been the period in which the U.S. has taken the world lead in the amount of direct foreign investment. "In twenty years (1950s and 1960s) American foreign investment increased eight

times" (Brooke & Remmers, 1970, p. 2). American foreign investment in the post war period build-up was more than welcome. However, in the past decade the climate has changed. The boom of investment caused clashes between such opposing fields as the financial interests of parent company and subsidiaries, host country nationally oriented against internationally oriented, local autonomy against central control, according to Brook and Remmers (1970). Kendall (1973) as chairman of the Emergency Committee for American Trade representing the American Corporation defends the multinational as being an internationalizer of technology and a model for other forms of international cooperation.

Taking a position "pro" or "anti" the multinational enterprise is not the purpose of this paper. However, the present climate in which the multinational operates is significant to its consideration. B. Teague (1976) refers to the "cooler climate" for Americans abroad attributing it to newly found national pride of emerging nations and world wide economic factors. He also sees U.S. corporative thinking changing because of threats to investment abroad: "intervention, control, tax treatment, disorder, threat of appropriation" (p. 2). Despite this "cooler climate" and corporate reticence B. Teague brings out there are more Americans abroad than ever and substantiates that with figures from the number of U.S. business passports. In 1950, 27,000 were issued, in 1970 40,000, and in 1974

268,000 (1976, p. 2). Although the reasons for such an increase have not been explored, it is obvious that in sheer numbers of people U.S. business is in the overseas scene.

One last characteristic of the multinational enterprise is so taken for granted that it is not brought out in either of the definitions cited. It is that the multinational company's main motive is profit. The former definitions are in terms of structure. However the characteristic of motivation for profit as the central mission of the multinational is basic to the formation of its structures and behavior of its personnel. The profit motive is the reason why companies become multinational and remains uppermost in their management policies of their foreign subsidiaries.

B. The problem I intend to explore is the process the U.S. multinational employs in sending parent country nationals abroad for service in a subsidiary. I will look first at the process in its fullest form by citing practical and theoretical viewpoints in current literature and include my own views as I synthesize. Then I will look at the actual practices, according to this process, used by multinationals. Finally I will define the problem area by showing the disparity between the fullest definition of the process "at best" and the actual process as practiced "in reality." The rationale behind identifying this as a problem will be clarified by returning to the definition of the multinational in Part I.

II. THE PROCESS: "AT BEST"--A FIVE PART DESCRIPTION

The process of sending overseas to a foreign subsidiary, sustaining, and bringing back to the U.S., a parent country national employee is composed of several steps. How the parent company of a multinational defines its role in this process is a question of the identity it establishes as a multinational. Therefore identity formation is the first step (1) of the process and determines whether to send a parent-country national to fill a position in a subsidiary company or whether to use a host national.

If a parent company maintains an identity of national orientation, it follows that it will establish its policy decisions as the central themes for the operation of its foreign subsidiaries. Therefore the company will be more likely to send one of the parent company employees abroad to fill a position so that its host country employees will adhere closely to headquarter's policies. However, if the parent company identity is more international in orientation it will be more flexible in allowing its subsidiaries to set policies according to host country norms and will allow greater autonomy in operation. With an international identity a parent company is more likely to fill a position in the foreign subsidiary with a host country national. Various degrees of control by the parent company result in

staffing policies which run like downward steps on a ladder, from the high degree of an almost totally U.S. run operation, to sending a manager only (a frequent form of control), to sending of middle management only, to sending parent country nationals to open a new branch or initiate a new mode of operation, to the low degree of total management of foreign operation by host nationals.

Chambers (1973) believes that internationalizing is essential for the development of creative approaches in international management. He thinks that multinationals should be truly multinational in character and thinking. He believes that foreign nationals should be top executives in their own countries and that inter-cultural interaction should take place at the highest management levels. Blue and Haynes (1977) state that "a cross-cultural way of thinking must pervade all . . . levels of the multinational corporation itself" (p. 62). F. Teague (1970) suggests three general objectives for long range development: "The development of a cadre of international managers, international functional skill throughout for breadth of perspective, and a long range international perspective" (p. 5). Ackermann (1976) also emphasizes the importance of multi-level training in multinationals so that the outlook across the board is international. In Teague's introduction to Selecting and Orienting Staff for Service Overseas, he notes that the new national pride in emerging countries has made for a cooler

atmosphere for Americans working abroad. Because of this new nationalism, demands for greater autonomy of operation in foreign subsidiaries are being placed on parent companies. Therefore their voices are added to those of the above authors who suggest internationalizing as part of a creative, positive business approach.

Theoretically considered, the entity of the corporation is similar in its policy setting to an individual considering whether to interact interculturally and determining what is his/her position in that interaction. The corporation, like an individual, may adopt an ethnocentric stance, in which it considers itself, its know-how and its methods superior, and conversely the way a foreign subsidiary functions as inferior. As Blubaugh and Pennington (1976) point out such "blocking assumptions" which may or may not have factual underpinnings, are a deterrent to communication. Warren and Adler (1977) outline two approaches to crosscultural training based on the assumption that in order to effectively communicate, a person must become aware of his own cultural biases and his own ethnicity in approach. Cultural general training approaches are based on the theory that a person, like a multinational entity, is more open to and better able to communicate with a person of another culture (in this case the entity of the subsidiary) once his own cultural peculiarities have been perceived. In considering the development within a multinational of a more international approach to achieve more

creative management, the company must become more aware of its own cultural biases affecting its operation so that it becomes more open to a rational and factual consideration of the methods used by host nationals in the subsidiaries of another culture. The open-minded approach of a multinational permits the development of a truly international outlook as well as the respectful atmosphere required for dealing with individuals, companies and countries who have pride in their own patterns of behavior.

The second part of the process of sending abroad, sustaining and bringing back a parent country national is (2) "selection." Who shall do the selecting, whom they shall select and how they shall do this are the basic elements of the selection process. F. Teague in an article on the selection of international managers points out that the process (of selection) in an international scale is more difficult because of the circumstances . . . since the demands on managers there are likely to be greater" (1970, p. 2). B. Teague underscores the importance of the selection process: "Most personnel executives agree that the selection of the candidate for foreign service is the point at which success or failure of the assignment is determined" (1976, p. 8).

Who shall do the selecting as well as disqualifying has obvious importance. F. Teague (1970) expresses the opinion that if top management is to make the selection and

rely on intuition and personal judgment, they must have more face-to-face contact with potential senior managers as well as a breadth of knowledge about the job situation in its international setting. B. Teague (1976 both articles) outlines a complex process of selection involving top management, personnel staff, manpower and career-planning staff, line executives, the employee himself or herself and the spouse. B. Teague sees that such a combination of those who select allows for a long term and international vision in the use of personnel in the multinational as well as the down to the minute and personal considerations. The long term vision comes from top management with an "international" outlook (referred to in part (1) of the overall process) and from the inclusion of "career and manpower" staff who attend both to the development of the company's "international" staff and to the overall career development of the individual employees. The more immediate considerations involve the line staff assessment of the technical abilities of the candidate, the personality qualifications assessment by the personnel staff, and finally the personal assessment of the conditions of employment by the employee himself and his wife.

Whom these persons will select depends on two factors: the pool of candidates from whom they will be selected and the criteria for selection and elimination. B. Teague's (1976) description above suggests that manpower and career planning personnel already have an overall plan preparing

certain employees for certain types of jobs. Therefore when an overseas job requisition is presented to the personnel staff, they may call on manpower personnel to suggest possible candidates. The personnel staff also has its own files of employees with qualifications correlating to the job requirements. Therefore the technical qualifications of the job largely define the pool of those qualified for consideration.

It is in the establishment of the criteria for selection that international outlook, cross-cultural thinking, comes clearly to the fore again. F. Teague points out that the process is more difficult and getting the right man is "more important" in an international position than in the usual intranational situation. Different criteria must be set for the selection of overseas personnel than domestic because the circumstances under which s/he will work will be different, therefore the personal requirements of the job will be different. Some of these differences according to F. Teague (1970) involve "new ventures, new products, new markets, physical distance from corporate (head office) activity, giving attention and guidelines, operating outside of the scope of established organization and policy in a different management process" (p. 3). All these different aspects result from the development of an organization of the company in a different cultural environment.

The first criterion of selection is technical competence with the qualifications even higher than in the same

domestic position. This is clearly important in accordance with the F. Teague's reasons listed above. The parent country national may indeed be operating in a new area without support. B. Teague (1976) adds another reason: "Resident (host) nationals will overlook qualities in an American they believe are abrasive if he is efficient, and knowledgeable and can get results from them. . . ." (p. 11). Another criterion which a few firms mention is foreign language facility. Blue and Haynes (1977) assess this as an indicator of adaptability, but it may also be considered as a technical qualification.

Personal criteria come next, vary from company to company, and are considered more important and complex than in a domestic position. B. Teague in "Transplanting Executives in Foreign Soil," (1976) says that these criteria may "vary from culture to culture, job to job, and location to location even within the same country." Setting the personal criteria is therefore extremely complex, but certain traits have come out in the writings. One of these is adaptability (mentioned in Blue & Haynes (1977), B. Teague (1976), and F. Teague (1970)). B. Teague believes that adaptability encompasses "above-average" interpersonal skills and "cultural empathy" (1976, p. 92). It also involves patience, flexibility and open-mindedness. Blue and Haynes (1977) list characteristics which they believe indicate adaptability: "desire for change, new challenge, variety of supervising experiences, knowledge

of foreign language(s), overseas travel, recent immigration or foreign heritage, work experience with different cultures, consistent cooperativeness and willingness to collaborate" (p. 65). These authors also list "presence of bigotry, including a belief in the superiority of American management practices and technology," as a criterion for elimination.

These intertwining criteria emanating from "adaptability" give rise to the more specific personal criteria which indicate the presence of adaptability relating both to the employee and his spouse (and perhaps teenage children). B. Teague in "Transplanting Executives in Foreign Soil" (1976) says that such questions as "How mobile are he and his family, will a transfer involve a family separation, will there be educational problems for the children" (p. 43) must all be considered in selection. Blue and Haynes (1977) advocate spouses and mature dependents be subjected to some sort of selection criteria to assess whether they can adjust to new household, lifestyle, friends, status in the community, restrictions on freedom, lack of conveniences, new food and climate, social value system, etc. (p. 64).

How the process of selection is carried out proceeds logically from 'who' does it and 'what' are the criteria. Obviously line management will be involved in assessing technical qualifications according to past company performance. Records of past performance are prepared by the personnel department from reports of line management and from

their own records. The main activity in selection is interviewing. B. Teague in "Transplanting Executives in Foreign Soil" (1976) notes "most companies rely heavily on multiple interviews process." Line executives interview to determine "knowledge and breadth" of technical ability, personnel executives interview to determine personality "fit" (criteria of "adaptability" herein assessed) and wives and teenage children may be interviewed to determine their adaptability in terms of criteria above-mentioned. Blue and Haynes (1977) emphasize that "those who select should be as familiar with the environment of the place of assignment as with the specific professional requirements of the job in question. They emphasize that "fit" of employee and specific job and cultural setting are essential elements of consideration and should be brought out in the interview process.

Two forms of the selection process also are considered parts of the orientation process, but remain in "selection" because they provide information to the candidate and his wife on which they may base a decision to disqualify themselves. The first of these is a pre-transfer visit to the country of selection. F. Teague and B. Teague both refer to this as a positive in-put into selection. B. Teague sees it as an opportunity to "appraise the environment" and its possible effects on them (the family). In this case the employee and family estimate their own adaptability and their desire to adapt as well.

B. Teague (1976) emphasizes the importance of the candidate being able to disqualify himself at any point in the orientation program. As the candidate and his family learn more about the future job and cultural setting they have more information on which to base a decision whether to take the position or not. During orientation according to B. Teague "something may arise that is insurmountable in the eyes of the family. It is late--but not too late to turn back" (p. 14). During orientation those who are running the program may also discover a reason why the candidate or family should be disqualified due to the fact that they are unable to meet such set qualifications as "adaptability" or the presence of the disqualifying factor of "bigotry."

In selection the crosscultural focus moves from the larger entity of the parent organization out towards the person it will send as its representative to carry out a mission in a foreign subsidiary. In order to ensure the faithful transmission of the parent company message the p.c. employee must be able to smoothly function with the competence displayed in the home country setting while operating under new sets of technical and social conditions. Therefore, a composite group of those who know the requirements of the position (top management with experience in a foreign company) and those who specialize in judging interpersonal skills (personnel executives) combine their efforts in this crucial task.

This group must set criteria for the choice based on their knowledge of technical requirements but without a tool for measurement of the quality of 'adaptability' so necessary for job performance in a foreign setting. In defining adaptability by generating their own list of essential personal characteristics they shy away from persons set in their ways and look for the open-minded, flexible, creative candidate whom they still find solid enough to trust in the position. Through this careful process the company seeks out a person who is not ethnocentric and who reproduces as an individual the internationally-minded larger entity of the multi-national.

Once the second part of the process has taken place (in fact there may be overlap) part (3), orientation, may begin. There are three principal types of orientation training: technical, language, and cultural. Since by selection the home country national is technically competent technical training will be aimed at the new foreign situation and most likely be at the head office by someone who has either held the position in the foreign subsidiary or knows it well.

Language training is a valuable tool for the whole family. B. Teague (1976) notes "Perhaps the most important single knowledge an expatriate can acquire to smooth his adjustment to life in a foreign country is at least a phrase book grasp of the language of that country" (p. 16). Brislin

and Pedersen (1976) believe that the most valuable topics for adjusting to the host country are learning the native customs and language, but they place language as the most important. Language training links logically with technical training in terms of the functioning of the parent country employee in the foreign setting. Through interaction made possible by language training he is able to learn more from his co-workers directly about the specific task he is to perform and the circumstances which surround it. Sometimes larger companies do not place a high priority on language learning, as among the larger number of people in their subsidiaries there are those who speak English. In such a case the situation of the wife and children may be different, as they may spend more of their time and have more social interactions out in the daily-life world of the new culture where it is unlikely that English is spoken. While the male employee focuses on his work situation the focus of the wife's attention is the setting of the family into the new wider social scene of the foreign environment. Edwards (1978, p. 38) quotes Alison Lanier of Overseas Briefing Associates: "She (the wife) has daily exposure to the culture and most times, is given very little help in adjusting to it."

It is difficult to discuss technical and language training in orientation without bringing in "crosscultural training." Carrying out a technical task in the subsidiary, the employee's role, or settling into those tasks which form

the core of a wife's and mother's role all take place in the social context of a culture. That language is intertwined in the structure of culture both defining it and being defined by it is brought out by Hoijer (Samovar & Porter, 1976, p. 150) in discussing his studies of language and the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis. Hoijer quotes Sapir (1929) "the worlds in which different societies live are distinct worlds, not merely the same world with different labels attached." Therefore learning a language provides the tools for communication but cultural training provides the clues for understanding the meaning of the language.

No one form of crosscultural training exists for multinationals as the way to prepare its domestic employee (as a family) for service abroad. Programs may be "in-house," that is prepared by the international division of the parent company at its own headquarters or another designated location but under its direction; or at other locations such as special institutes organized for crosscultural training; or through special crosscultural programs at the larger universities; or in the designated host country under the direction of employees of the foreign subsidiary or those host country nationals already staticned there. Programs may be formal and highly planned learning situations or they may be informal advice-giving or experience-sharing sessions with those knowledgeable of the foreign situation.

Approaches to training may be either culture general or culture specific: aimed at a general understanding of the

self as a cultural being and others different from the self as shaped by their own culture, or aimed at the specific complex situational aspects of the culture to be experienced. Training may also be a combination of the two. Whatever its focus, it is aimed at the reduction of what Oberg (undated publication) defines as "culture shock" and the implementing of smooth functioning of the employee and his family in the new situation. Thanks to Oberg "culture shock" has emerged to recognition as a common malady in moving from one culture to another, precipitated by the anxiety that results from losing all our familiar signs and symbols of social intercourse" (p. 1).

Warren and Adler (1977) identify four common models of intercultural training: (1) the practical-functional approach--the primary function of which is to build competency and expertise in specific skill areas. Training is geared to role-functioning but understanding the conditions of the culture are included; (2) the cognitive-didactic approach--a traditional approach based on information transmission and highly culture-specific; (3) the affective-personal approach in which self-awareness and world view are considered basic in opening one's sensitivity to and understanding of others; and (4) the experiential approach--an eclectic style combining many of the aspects of other approaches but placing high value on "trainees reaching insights about themselves." The training gets at this combined cognitive and affective goal through structuring participative educational experiences.

Ackermann (1976, p. 304) points out the many variables which come into training because it "should be tailored to needs of participants, corporations, and host countries." Therefore the length of training also varies; but most authors stress that time spent in training insures against time lost on the job. Ackermann comments on time: "ideally, briefing precedes departure by six to eight weeks, but, in fact, lead time has been as short as ten days" (p. 304).

Training--technical, language, and cultural makes sense in the whole view of the multinational as a process which seeks to ensure that the host national employee fulfills the purpose of his mission. The larger multinational finds greater creativity and smoothness of functioning operating as an internationally or open-minded entity. Therefore it makes sense that its representative abroad will also function more smoothly, representing as an individual that same stance. Crosscultural training is preventative medicine in terms of culture shock, a "malady" which interrupts smooth functioning. These elements in crosscultural training, as emphasized in the "affective personal approach" and "the experiential approach" (Warren and Adler, 1977) which aim at self-realization as a cultural being, break down ethnocentricity while the methods of the practical-functional and cognitive-didactic approach as well as language training tend to make more comprehensible the new cultural situation. Oberg says that in a new culture one loses all (our) familiar signs

and symbols of social intercourse" (p. 1) and disorientation results in anxiety. Therefore the culture specific learning in orientation programs gives meaning to the signs and cues of the new culture whereby a new orientation is effected.

Warren and Adler prefer an eclectic approach, and combining methods makes theoretical sense in terms of the process of orientation training in the setting of the multinational. Those aspects of training which aim at cancelling out bigotry and at open-mindedness prepare an employee and his family to be continuous learners. This is certainly essential for creative living in a new environment both on the job and in the wider social community. Culture specific learning including learning of the language provides a framework of knowledge about a new cultural setting which already establishes a base for social interaction on arrival--ensuring smoother functioning sooner. Therefore the home country employee functions well in terms of himself or herself, causing smooth functioning of the subsidiary, which in turn causes smooth, in-tune functioning of the multinational as a whole.

The fourth step (4) in the process is reentry.* B. Teague (1976, p. 44) brings out two aspects of change for

---

*The function of the head office between the (3) orientation of the employee and (4) his/her reentry will be discussed in (5) as a background function of the multinational. Section (5) of this process focuses on the role of the head office of the parent company which infuses all the process and does not fit a chronological order of employee-focused training.

the employee in reentry in order to establish a need for consideration of this step in training. First the employee is "not returning to the society he knew." (There have been) "Social changes, legal changes, economic changes; and perhaps most acutely felt of all, personal financial changes." Secondly, the employee himself has changed. "For the first time, perhaps, he is viewing his own culture with foreign eyes." Though Moeller (1977) speaks in terms of the wider realm of cultural exchange, he focuses his dissertation on reentry training, which he considers should be an integral part of (orientation) program planning. B. Teague (1976, p. 44) says that "probably" culture shock in reverse is overly strong language, but Moeller says "both (entry into a new culture and reentry to the home culture) are characterized by discontinuities referred to as 'culture shock'" (p. 50).

Since Moeller approaches reentry from the position of cultural exchange he sees successful cultural readjustment as essential; for the purpose of exchange is the integration of one's own cultural learning, and learning in the new foreign culture, resulting in increased understanding of both cultures. This increased understanding of a returning expatriate also can have meaning for the multinational.

In articulating the differences between the original culture shock experienced upon arrival in the foreign country and the shock upon return to one's own country Moeller gives what could be a theoretical basis for thinking out a reentry

program for returning employees of a multinational corporation. He states six points in terms of advantages and disadvantages of the employee on reentry over entry: (1) Advantage--knowledge of home systems as they were structured; (2) Disadvantage--not expecting things to be different nor realizing the extent of his/her own change; (3) Disadvantage--limited access, if any, to program or facilities to help; (4) Disadvantage--members of home system expecting he will be the same person; (5) Disadvantage--wanting to innovate in terms of what he had learned which will not be universally welcomed, and (6) Advantage--greater time to integrate, but (perhaps disadvantage) stay is relatively permanent. A program built on capitalizing on the advantage of reentry and compensating for the disadvantages, as described by Moeller, would be one proceeding from the advantage of knowledge of the culture, to updating the employee in terms of its changes during his/her absence, to focusing on realization of changes in the self, and then to predicting the possible impact of these changes on others.

The multinational parent company's part played in reintegration can be mutually beneficial both to the returning employee and the company. In this it is similar to cultural exchange. The parent company can heighten as positive the changes which have occurred in its employee by using rather than resisting his/her innovative ideas resulting from learning in the foreign environment. This

would effect a positive reentry experience for the employee, by respecting what he has learned, and lead to a learning experience on "internationalizing" for the parent company. In part (1) of the process such a direction was seen as positive to the overall functioning of the multinational.

In part (5) of the process the focus returns to the parent company of the multinational, and to its relationship with the p.c. employee during service outside the home country. This section is closely related to part (1) in that it is a refinement in more concrete terms of the international identity referred to therein. If a parent company sets truly internationally-minded policies in relationship to its employees abroad and treats them with a sensitivity resulting from a broad perspective then this internationalism affects the previous steps mentioned as well as the interim policy between sending the employee out and bringing him/her back.

Blue and Haynes (1977) from their vantage points as executives in a multinational, emphasize the importance of the international outlook. They see it as vital in selection--"those who select should be as familiar with the environment of the place of assignment as with . . . the unique pressures and obstacles involved in getting the job done" (p. 61). They believe that one criterion for weeding out candidates is the presence of bigotry and identify the American business bigot as a firm believer in the superiority

of American practices and technology, which gives an air superiority. They believe that "preparation for overseas" should be part of an on-going process in any multinational which could make the selection, placement and preparation for a job relatively easy. Otherwise no matter how costly and time-consuming, a tailor made preparation program should be planned. The authors suggest that a multinational outlook should pervade all levels of the organization with language training by nationals of the country available to all employees for opening up a sensitivity to foreign subsidiaries. They feel international travel should be "a necessary adjunct of normal responsibilities" (p. 66). Returning to specific orientation programs as discussed in part (3) of the process of this paper, the authors believe that with the development of internationally minded attitudes throughout the multinational, the chosen candidate will already have lost ethnocentricity (or else have gotten weeded out in selection) and specialized area training for him and family should be detailed and preferably given by a national of the designated country.

Zeira (1975) in a diagnostic study of 248 subsidiaries found that "where such corporations retain an ethnocentric (parent-oriented) structure, morale problems are likely to develop" (p. 96). They found that "in all subsidiaries surveyed, the perceptions of expatriates and host country nationals concerning proper patterns of management were at

variance." "They (host country nationals) claimed that their superiors (parent country nationals) were disloyal to the corporation; they tended to adopt their managerial behavior to head quarters expectations, . . . even though this adjustment was contrary to the needs of the subsidiary" (p. 98).

Zeira generalizes from the finding of this dysfunctional state, concluding that the entire multinational needs a change in perspective--"a crucial hole needs to be filled" (p. 102). His conclusion is--the gap between present and desired managerial patterns must be eliminated by new staffing policies. He wants changes in the behavior of top management and those would be changes affecting the entire outlook of the companies. His suggestions include: (1) changing selection--proper personnel techniques: tests, simulations, etc.; (2) Changing pre and post departure training programs to include the "human problems" of international enterprises; (3) Criterion of selection should include capability to work out solutions to local morale problems; (4) The inclusion of host country nationals in the central personnel departments; and (5) The use of diagnostic studies to increase familiarity with the subsidiaries.

Both Blue and Haynes and Zeira bring out the necessity of keeping in touch with the realities of the functioning--both technical and social--of subsidiaries as a basis for improving the functioning of the multinational. This supranational sensitivity affects all previously mentioned

steps and provides for a home organization sensitive to the needs of its subsidiary and the host country employee in the field. The bigotry which Blue and Haynes refer to is therefore eliminated both in the employee sent abroad and in the total multinational organization.

I previously touched on financial help as mentioned by B. Teague (1976) as a part of (4) "reentry." B. Teague (1975) also discusses pay premiums which are a source of incentive and compensation in the departure process from home country to host country and during the period of foreign assignment. Teague refers to the practice of paying foreign service premiums as "Extra Pay for Executive Culture Shock" (p. 18). These payments are added on to salaries and are separate from allowances for housing, cost of living, tax equalization and other benefits. They were payed decades ago to compensate for physical hardships such as climate, but technology, has reduced the hardship element in physical conditions so that payments are now for the psychological aspects of change, commonly referred to as "culture shock." They are considered as compensation not only for culture shock while in a foreign post, but for the social gap which the employee and family experience upon returning to the home country, the after affects of the discontinuity in their lives resulting from foreign employment.

In his 1974 survey of 101 companies B. Teague found that despite the fact that rethinking of the foreign service

premium payment is going on, in comparison with a 1972 study of 267 companies there is little change in the overall prevalence of the practice (67% of companies pay the premium). In listing the reasons companies give for paying the premium, foremost is providing the incentive to stay overseas. Among those companies who are changing 14 percent are adopting the policies while, in contrast, 9 percent are planning on phasing out premiums, 5 percent are abandoning their payment and 5 percent will lower them. Those who do not pay the premium say they believe their compensation package is competitive without the premium.

Ackermann (1976, p. 300) discusses the pragmatic thinking characteristic of U.S. businessmen. She refers to the achievement oriented questions, "what works?" "How much," the type of thinking which has spelled success at home. Zeira (1978) and Blue and Haynes (1977) have urged an international outlook, a holistic view of operations by the multinational, truly as multinational. It seems to me that the payment of premiums is a U.S. ethnocentric approach to getting parent country national employees to a foreign assignment and keeping them there. It has the hidden implication that only extra money can make the assignment meaningful and worth it to the employee and his family. Such an ethnocentric U.S. attitude sustains a similar ethnocentric view of foreign employment in the employee and his family. It is counter to the goals of orientation training which open the employee's

vision to the learning opportunities of the new culture, and to the foreign service situation as of intrinsic reward value. The need for paying such a premium also implies that the multinational indeed sees the foreign employment as a loss situation to the employee and that they have failed to adequately provide for it in terms of the career development of the individual employee. It also suggests that the valuing of his foreign experience as an addition to the international knowledge of the company is not a reality. The paying of the premium also seems to mean that compensation for individual aspects of change both in leaving and returning, i.e., moving expenses, educational expenses, higher food prices, etc., has not been satisfactorily thought out and provided for. (This aspect of support is indeed the multinationals' responsibility as employer.) Though its payment is considered a positive aspect of a multinational's treatment of its foreign employees, I have the bias that it is a short term, cover-up solution--U.S. ethnocentric style--for the lack of a truly internationally minded, well-integrated policy by the multinational for its employees who are sent abroad.

III. THE PROCESS: "IN REALITY"

In section II of this paper a five part process was described by which a multinational sends overseas, sustains, and brings back a host country employee. An attempt was made

to describe these steps according to authors cited and my thinking based on a synthesis of their writings, as involving an integrated and related procedure by which an internationally-minded and selective multinational enterprise prepares a host country employee for a successful cross-cultural communication, supports that communication and makes use of that communicative experience. The procedure is "integrated" because all the steps affect each other and "related" because the actor and the acted upon in each step form a part of the functioning whole of the multinational and all are mutually dependent.

In section III, I will rely mainly on the research of two authors to give some indication of what is actually happening in this process in U.S. multinationals. In 1976 B. Teague wrote a report based on data provided by 33 major international companies (11 with 11 to 34 home country nationals working overseas, 11 with 35 to 100, and 11 with 101 to 1400). (I will refer to these as the smaller, medium size, and larger companies) concerning their process of Selecting and Orienting Staff for Service Overseas. These figures provide the most comprehensive overview of the whole process I have found in my research. I will also use a field study of my own conducted in 1977-1978 of 19 U.S. multinationals in the top 50 in terms of sales in 1977, and 18 Michigan multinationals in Fortune's list of the top 1000 corporations in 1973. My approach in addressing the multinationals was an

open-ended question asking their approach to the preparation of U.S. employees they send for service abroad, allowing the respondents to identify the elements they felt merited mention.

The content of Section A is the presentation of current practices as revealed in the research of the two authors mentioned above. The content of Section B is a discussion of these findings, and the content of Section C is a summary overview of the combined findings of both authors in relationship to the overall process defined in Section II.

A. Neither B. Teague's study nor mine yields much specific information relative to part (1) of the process, identity of the multinational, which determines its outlook as either an ethnocentric entity or an internationally minded one. As I pointed out in step one this "set" or stance determines the degree of autonomy of the subsidiary. On the one hand Teague cites certain factors which he feels have reversed the trend of the multinational in the '50s and '60s toward increasing direct foreign investment abroad; and on the other hand he cites figures which show increased U.S. involvement in terms of members of businessmen abroad. However in general discussion he touches on ethnocentricity--"It is becoming more and more apparent that American business in foreign lands will have to give more attention in adapting to local styles in product, method of operation and approach" (p. 3).

In my research I found that in the Michigan sample which included smaller companies (top 1000) than the national sample (top 50) the overwhelming trend, 14 out of 18 companies was to employ host nationals in subsidiaries. In my U.S. sample of larger companies only 4 out of 19 companies replied that they used mostly host nationals. Such results would seem to indicate that not only identity of the corporation determines the amount of autonomy given to a subsidiary but also the size. Therefore control over subsidiaries for smaller companies will not come through sending of employees from the parent country. Coordination through communication at the very top levels of management will be necessary. Such cross-cultural communication does not fall under the topic of the paper, but international outlook from the highest levels of management does. I will only mention in passing that the communication burden on high management levels is more intense when there is no mediating man in the field.

In the large U.S. multinationals where choice was in operation regarding the degree of autonomy allowed in subsidiaries 15 of the 19 respondents chose to send employees abroad to foreign subsidiaries. One company said they sent employees only for development of new organizations and one for specific new technologies. For the most part specifics of the process rather than approach in terms of identity was referred to.

In Teague's research a difference was found between what the personnel executives said they believed about (2) selection for foreign service and what actually happened. "Most personnel" agreed that selection was the point of success or failure of an assignment and that setting of criteria was where the process should begin. However Teague notes: "Despite this, it is apparent from the responses obtained from the companies cooperating in this study, that the selection procedure varies but little from that used by many companies for manpower posting in the U.S." (p. 8). After a discussion of the varying approaches to determining criteria he lists the traits most often mentioned as desirable: technical ability, supervisory ability, organizing ability, adaptability. Of these only adaptability including cultural empathy, is clearly separate from home country needs of the same position.

Information about the candidates in selection came in all companies from past records of the employees' job history. All personnel selection executives felt they needed more information. In most companies the selection process included multiple interviews. Many companies also included the wives in some interviews. Teague also mentions pretransfer visits and orientation as parts of the selection process. He has specific figures for pretransfer visits. Ten out of 33 companies offered the visits: 2 in the large companies, 6 in the medium sized companies, and 2 in the smaller companies.

In my study of the larger U.S. companies 13 out of 19 companies did not mention selection, 2 companies mentioned willingness of the employee and the family as criteria, one mentioned language fluency, background of ties to location, extended family, marriage and maturity--social, emotional and intellectual. In terms of the process, the use of orientation to weed out including self-disqualification was mentioned, also screening in 4 to 6 hours of interviews, and a previsit for husband and wife. All these were mentioned once. Of the four firms in Michigan who do send employees abroad two criteria were mentioned once each: flexibility and ability to train a host national to fill a post. In terms of the process, family interview was mentioned once to determine characteristics and attitudes to indicate success or failure. What these characteristics and attitudes were was not mentioned. Two mentioned a family exploration trip as a possibility.

In terms of part (3) of the process, orientation programs, Teague found that 15 out of 33 companies had formal in-house programs--9 of the larger companies, 3 of the medium sized companies, and 3 of the smaller companies. In my study 12 out of the 19 large U.S. firms had formal in-house programs with 6 including spouses and 3 including teenage children. Of these 12, 6 gave culture specific programs for which they prepared their own materials, 1 used materials prepared by a consultant, 1 emphasized awareness of cultural differences and 1 gave the program only if there was a sufficient number.

Seven of these U.S. firms also mentioned informal orientation as part of the process. Thirteen U.S. firms mentioned preparing informational materials (including the 6 mentioned above) and of these, 4 had materials prepared by those working in the subsidiary. Two mentioned the preparation of audio-visual materials including movies, slides, and tapes. Of the Michigan firms in my study one had a culture specific orientation program and two mentioned the preparation of informational materials.

Teague found that 11 out of the 33 firms surveyed used orientation programs of outside consultants: 6 of the larger companies, 3 of the medium size companies, and 2 of the smaller companies. Of the 19 U.S. firms in my study, 3 used programs of outside consultants, and 2 of the Michigan firms used outside consultants.

Teague found that 16 out of 33 firms required language training: 4 of the larger firms, 6 of the medium size and 6 of the smaller. Nine of the larger firms in my study mentioned language training and two of the Michigan firms.

Regarding part (4) of the process reentry, Teague reported that one-third of the 33 surveyed gave at least some aspect of help to the employee on reentry. Usually this help had to do with finances but might include temporary housing and help with other "moving" technicalities. One company mentioned that they felt reentry shock was equivalent to culture shock experienced upon entry into a foreign

country. None of the companies I contacted mentioned reentry.

The general supportive behavior of the multinational which has a broad international outlook, part (5) of the process, is not directly touched on by Teague in this study. In my study of the U.S. firms, one mentioned providing home leaves to keep the employee and family in contact and four referred to extra pay benefits. In discussing pay benefits under part (5) of the process, I referred to an article by B. Teague 1974 in which the common practice of paying premiums was brought out as an aspect of back-up support of the parent company. There are no other references in either of Teagues' studies nor in the data I collected to the creation of a total organization sensitive to international concerns including the problems and learning of those employed in foreign subsidiaries.

B. An interpretation of the meaning of these two studies will allow a comparison between what ideally could be included in the process and what is indicated by these studies as actually going on. Not much information was yielded by either study as to part (1) of the process, whether multinationals consider their identity to be "international," nor to whether this dictates the giving of more autonomy to subsidiaries. Teague noted that U.S. multinationals will have to "adapt" because of new national sensitivities in foreign countries, but this seems more of a pragmatic approach of how

to get along rather than any profound "international" outlook. I found a correlation between the size of companies and their policies of sending employees abroad with the smaller Michigan companies relying on host nationals mainly. The high correlation between smaller companies and host country employees only suggests that factors other than freely determined international outlook influences this policy.

Teague's report of data on selection was somewhat confusing. He found it significant that the process differed little from the process used for positioning employees in the U.S. Information came from past records but that which was unique to overseas employment came out in interviews. The unique criterion seemed to be adaptability but even that seemed to vary significantly between companies. In my study selection was barely mentioned and then different criteria were mentioned once.

Information on actual cultural orientation programs part (3) of the process was somewhat more solid. In both Teague's and my study over half of the larger companies had their own in-house orientation programs. More than half of the programs (12 of 19) in my study were culture-specific programs with informational materials prepared by the corporation. Informal orientation was also significantly represented in the larger U.S. firms of my study. Over one-third of Teague's firms had orientation programs given by outside consultants. This means that 26 out of 33 firms

Teague surveyed provided some form of orientation. In my study 13 of 19 U.S. firms prepared informational materials, even though only 6 mentioned using these in the formal programs. Language training was also found to be required by over half of Teague's surveyed companies and over half of the U.S. companies in my study also provided for language training.

Reentry training part (4) of the process was a neglected area of concern in both studies as were other aspects of behavior indicating sensitive support from an internationally-minded parent company part (5) of the process. The exception to this is the mention of foreign service premiums injected from Teague's 1974 study.

C. A total overview of both studies reveals an awareness of concern in multinationals perhaps for purposes of adapting to new demands in foreign countries, of providing orientation preparation to those selected for foreign service. There are no consistent criteria for selection, part (2) of the process, except technical capability which is also the same for placing the employee in a position in a U.S. firm. Over half of the firms provide in-house informal orientation programs part (2) of the process; and the programs, according to those referred to in my study, seem mostly to be culture-specific, centered around information giving. Over half of the firms surveyed by Teague and half of the larger firms in my study provided for language training also included in

part (2) of the process, showing some, though hardly over-all, importance was placed on this communication tool. While the larger firms in Teague's study placed greater emphasis (in numbers of programs) on cultural orientation than the medium and smaller firms, they placed less emphasis on language learning. Reentry, part (4) of the process, was not mentioned at all in either study in terms of cultural considerations, and only minimally considered, according to Teague, in terms of technical help. Pervasive internationalization of thinking--either in conception of identity, part (1) of the process, or in the relationship of the MN to subsidiary and home country employee overseas, part (5) of the process--was not evident in either study.

IV. CONCLUSION: REVEALING THE PROBLEM THROUGH COMPARISON OF II AND III

Neither Teague's study nor mine indicates that there is a concern for developing in wider areas of policy making a truly non-ethnocentric outlook or an open international vision. This identity formation which influences all other aspects did not merit mention by the companies surveyed. Zeira (1975) mentions that host nationals found "disloyalty to the goals of the corporation in the ethnocentric behavior of the management policies of expatriate managers." It is my contention that unless goals are set from the highest levels of management, which are international and therefore loyal to

the smooth functioning of the multinationals both in the home country and in host countries, disloyalty to the entire company will be the result.

Selection, part (2) of the process, though admitted to be a crucial point in the process is varied and yet basically similar, according to Teague's study, to selection within the U.S. It was barely mentioned by my respondents. No agreement on criteria has been found between companies in all of the research I did and "adaptability" is vaguely defined and vaguely assessed.

The many complex issues of selection involving who shall choose, when they shall choose, how, by what criteria are revealed as crucial, according to Teague's evidence, but have no uniting theory or formula for organization.

According to both Teague's and my studies orientation both cultural and language is given importance by multinationals. The larger multinationals are particularly concerned with cultural orientation and for the most part either run their own programs or provide outside programs given by consultants. The thrust of the in-house cultural orientation programs referred to by the larger multinationals in my study was the presenting of informational materials. In discussing orientation in section II as a part of the process I brought out four approaches described by Warren and Adler (1977). While the informational approach used by most multinationals in my study is valuable, as I have noted, it does

not directly deal with revealing ethnocentric biases, and leading the employee to realize himself as the product of his own culture. Neither does it include the learning experience which is the object of the experiential approach as well as the affective personal approach, the reaching of insights about oneself. In these two approaches the focus is on learning rather than on giving information in preparing for experience in another culture. Therefore, a way of learning is transmitted to the employee and family which they may continue to use in the absence of the training program and in the new cultural environment where they are isolated from the parent company. In neglecting to use other than the traditional approach the multinationals are not using educational approaches which aim at developing an open mindedness and personal responsibility for learning which could facilitate the smooth and creative functioning of their employees sent overseas.

Language learning was a concern of slightly over one-half of the companies, which send employees abroad, surveyed by Teague and those reporting in my study. More companies were concerned with providing cultural training for their employees than language training. Ironically, more of the larger companies, according to Teague's research, provided cultural orientation programs than the middle-size or small firms, but less of the larger companies provided language training. The rationale behind this, mentioned by B. Teague

(1976) was that more persons spoke English in subsidiaries of larger firms. But such a rationale points toward thinking of the employee as functioning to accomplish a task of his work in narrow pragmatic terms. This is in contrast to the rationale of providing cultural training which aims at functioning on the job with an understanding of the surrounding social-cultural elements. In the original discussion of the "process" in Part II I mentioned the connection between language and culture as discussed by Hoijer in relationship to the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (Hoijer, 1976). If the two are inextricably intertwined then the presentation of either without the other is incomplete. The two together are the tools for further learning about the culture and each giving meaning to the other forms the basis for successful crosscultural communication.

Non-recognition and neglect of reentry, part (5) of the process, was reflected in both Teague's and my studies. Teague did note that consideration of financial assistance and help in technicalities was mentioned in some aspect by a third of the companies. Reentry according to Moeller's definition as being part of the whole aim of the original program is not a part of the thinking of multinationals at present as revealed in the studies cited. Their narrowly defined pragmatic and practical view of reentry reveals that the foreign experience of their employees does not fit into an overall international view, a multinational outlook. Since

the foreign experience of the employee is not thought of as a significant contribution to his/her career nor to the company as a whole, (implications of Teague's and my studies) then reentry becomes a neglected, problematic part of the process and is dealt with in a piece-meal pragmatic fashion.

In Part II I referred to a fifth part of the process in which, through concrete supportive actions, the parent company of the multinational reflects a sensitivity to the host country national as he works in a foreign subsidiary. Blue and Haynes (1977) and Zeira (1975) indicate the importance of multi-level international outlook within the multinational and Zeira emphasizes the importance of this in top-level management. I revealed my bias that foreign service premium payments while supposedly representing company response to the culture shock experience of their foreign employees was really a cover up to a generally insensitive approach and the negation of this part of the process. Neither Teague's study nor mine uncovered sensitivity and international outlook as prevailing in the multinationals investigated. Teague's 1974 article indicated the widespread extent of the use of foreign service premium payments, which I consider an indication of the extent of handing out extrinsic rewards for a basically intrinsically meaningless experience of foreign service as defined by the multinationals.* As in reentry this step seems to include, in

---

*Although not referred to in descriptions of employee preparation for foreign service, most companies do include in their informational materials description of equalization

the reality of Teague's and my study only narrow pragmatic consideration.

In order to arrive at a conclusion I return to Part I of this paper, the definition of a multinational in functional, historical, and motivational terms. In this section I posited the following characteristics of the multinational enterprise: (1) it owns or controls producing facilities in more than one country; (2) it has a locus of policy making in a home country, and subsidiaries to whom these policies are communicated and with whom they may be coordinated; (3) its historical setting includes a 20 year boom of becoming heavily involved in direct foreign investment with large numbers of personnel abroad, but a present period of a cooler reception abroad; and (4) it operates on the motivational basis of generation of profit.

My research and thinking leads me to conclude that a truly broadminded international outlook, which includes an understanding of one's own cultural biases as well as the cultural complexities of foreign host countries, is both functional and practical for the multinational as defined above. Operating on the basis of such an attitude enhances

---

compensation payments. The salary add-ons maintain the foreign employees' standard of living at the same level as their standard in the home country and are taken for granted by employers and employees as expressions of just employment conditions.

the creative functioning of the entire multinational complex and thereby facilitates the generation of profit.

Underlying the smooth, coordinated functioning of the multinational is cross-cultural communication. This takes place on two levels: (1) between the larger organizations of the parent company and the foreign subsidiary (an assymetrical relationship with power in the p.c. but still mutually dependent for functional purposes) and (2) between the host country national and those s/he works with in the subsidiary. In essence coordination at the macro-level between the larger entities through communication is the goal, but is carried out on the micro-level through the communication between host country national and the foreign nationals in the subsidiaries. (This step is eliminated where total autonomy of operation rests in the foreign subsidiary with coordination only at the macro-level). The host country national employee is therefore on a mission in which s/he epitomizes and represents the parent company.

Since smooth and creative functioning comes about through openmindedness and sensitive understanding of one's own culture and that of the other with whom one is communicating, development of crosscultural understanding and communication skills by the parent company are essential so that it may plan in a coordinated manner the process of sending, maintaining, and bringing back a parent country employee and back up, integrate, and utilize his/her foreign experience to compound its own multinational identity.

Narrow, pragmatic, piece meal planning of programs of preparation of host country employees in response to recognition of a cooler climate abroad or past failures of employees to function effectively in a foreign environment simply makes no sense in the total picture. Host country national dissatisfaction with foreign employment is built into a situation in which the larger parent company has not thought out its communication role on a macro-level. The individual employee cannot effectively represent a broadminded and culturally sensitive outlook, if the larger entity he represents is not that in essence. He is then indeed isolated and at every step undermined through a lack of support. A foreign service premium payment is then the final sugar coated insult, a cover-up for having sent an individual to communicate a fragmented message. A message so conceived and delivered will be of doubtful benefit to the sender, the carrier, and the receiver.

Morality in multinational terms or loyalty to the multinational are defined through its basic goal, the generation of profit. I conclude that the disparity between the actual practices in terms of the process of sending a host country national employee abroad by U.S. multinationals--as revealed through my research in this paper--and those practices, involving a truly international, broadminded approach--as outlined in section II as practically and theoretically sound--constitute a problem. This disparity reveals that

the creative and smooth functioning of multinationals which could result from an integrated process are neglected in its absence. The result is therefore a loss in such effective functioning and therefore a loss in profit. This is a negation of the motivational aspect by which a multinational is organized, and which forms the basis for its creation and continued existence. Therefore it is antithetical to its existence and should be remedied.

V. SUGGESTIONS

There is a general muddiness about the effectiveness of present orientation practices of multinational corporations. The extent of malfunctioning on the macro-level between parent companies and foreign subsidiaries and on the micro-level between parent company employees and host nationals in the foreign setting is not known. The relationship between amount and types of training and on the job functioning in foreign settings remains as yet a mystery. How many employees and their families return due to inability to function in the foreign setting are figures not readily available. What the actual loss is in terms of cost to the multinational has not been sufficiently documented to provide an overview of consequences. Even the easiest figures to obtain, the cost of sending a family abroad vary from as much as $34,000 to $210,000 (Edwards, 1978) and are usually presented without a formula for their understanding.

I suggest that further research is needed looking into the results of such variables as are mentioned in the process Part II of this paper so that in ever more specific terms multinationals may understand the results of piecemeal pragmatic, narrow-minded concepts of crosscultural training and the benefits of a truly multinational policy and outlook. The research could define the loss quantitatively through assessing money losses brought about in actual cases and qualitatively by showing types of misfunctioning illustrated by diagnostic investigation and individual case studies of employees.

Muddiness also pervades crosscultural training as a whole. What it is, who can use it, and how--needs to be brought to the attention of those who might benefit from knowledge of the field. Research into its effects needs to be done so that principles can be established, and that research needs to be widely published. Professional organizations committed to cross-cultural training and research need to bring together members of the field for purposes of mutual learning. These gathered professionals, adult educators joined in a new discipline, need to make their voices heard so that knowledge of the field comes about in those circles, i.e., government, universities, business where cross-cultural thinking can have an impact.

Finally, a theoretical base for crosscultural communication training as applicable to the multinational

corporation is needed. This will be founded on research as mentioned earlier in this section but will integrate as well learning theory, crosscultural communication theory, and a broad view of the purposes of the multinational corporation. The integration of research into an overall theoretical framework will allow for a clarification of the relationships of all the parts I described in the Process (Part II) and provide for the multinational an opportunity of making informed decisions about its crosscultural training policies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackermann, Jean Marie. "Skill Training for Foreign Assignment: The Reluctant U.S. Case." In Samova and Porter Intercultural Communication: A Reader. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1976, pp. 298-306.

Anderson, Dale A., and Quraeshi, Zahiv. "Michigan's Multinationals." Michigan State Economic Record, Vol. 17, No. 5 (Sept.-Oct. 1975).

Blue, Jeffrey L. and Haynes, Ulric, Jr. "Preparation for the Overseas Assignment." Business Horizons, Vol. 20, No. 3 (June 1977), pp. 61-67.

Brislin, Richardson and Pedersen, Paul. Cross-Cultural Orientation Programs. New York: Gardner, 1976.

Brooke, Michael L. and Remmers, H. Lee. The Strategy of Multinational Enterprise. New York: American Elsevier Publishing Co. Inc., 1970.

Chambers, Peter. "Internationalizing Top Management." International Management, Vol. 28, No. 8 (Aug. 1973), pp. 16-19.

Dunning, John A. (ed.). The Multinational Enterprise. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971, pp. 15-48.

Edwards, Linda. "Present Shock, and How to Avoid it Abroad." Across the Board, February 1978, pp. 36-43.

Harris, Philip R. and Harris, Dorothy L. "Cultural Training For International Management." (Newsletter) International Division, American Society for Training and Development, No. 5, April 1977, pp. 5-6.

Hoijer, Harry. "The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis." In Samovar and Porter. Intercultural Communication: A Reader. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1976, pp. 150-158.

Kendall, Donald M., Chairman. Emergency Committee for American Trade. The Multi-National Corporation: American Mainstay in the World Economy. Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 73-86648, 1973.

Moeller, Philip W. "Cultural Exchange: A Communication Model for Re-entry Transition." Ph.D. Dissertation, The American University, Washington, D.C., 1977.

Oberg, Kalerva. "Culture Shock and the Problem of Adjustment to New Cultural Environments." Talk given at the Women's Club of Rio De Janeiro. (Undated.)

Teague, Burton W. Selecting and Orienting Staff for Service Overseas. New York: The Conf. Bd. Inc., 1976.

Teague, Burton W. "Transplanting Executives in Foreign Soil." The Conference Board Record, Vol. XIII, No. 9 (Sept. 1976), pp. 42-45.

Teague, Burton W. "Extra Day for Executive Culture Shock." The Conference Board Record, Vol. XII, No. 1 (Jan. 1975), pp. 18-21.

Teague, Frederick A. "International Management Selection and Development." California Management Review, Vol. XII, No. 3 (Sept. 1970), pp. 1-6.

Warren, David and Adler, Peter. "An Experiential Approach to Instruction in Intercultural Communication." Communication Education, Vol. 23 (Mar. 1977).

Zeira, Yoram. "Overlooked Personnel Problems of Multinational Corporations." The Columbia Journal of World Business, Vol. X, No. 2 (Summer 1975).